REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated June 8, 2009. Claims 1-44 remain pending, where claims 4, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 27-43 are withdrawn from consideration. By this communication, claims 1 and 20 are amended. Support for the amended subject matter can be found, for example, in paragraph [0037] of Applicants' original disclosure.

In numbered paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23-26, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Lofgren et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,664,976). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As provided above, Applicants' claims 1 and 20 are amended to recite superimposing the modified video frame onto a terrain map of a region of interest wherein objects within the modified video frame are portrayed on a corresponding geo-location in the terrain map. The *Lofgren* patent fails to disclose or suggest at least this claim feature.

As discussed in a previous response, the *Lofgren* patent discloses an image measurement system and method that produces a digital watermark for an image. As shown in Figure 1, an image is communicated to a receiving or ground station where a watermark is embedded in the image to produce a watermarked image. The digital watermark includes a watermark identifier composed of plural bit data. The digital watermark can include image information such as metadata, related files, comments, file history, edit history, and/or security clearance information. Moreover, the *Lofgren* patent defines metadata as encompassing a variety of information such

as creation data, geo-location information, ancestry data, security information, access levels, copyright information, security classification, usage rights, and/or file history, among others.

The *Lofgren* patent, however, fails to disclose or suggest any features that can be reasonably correlated to Applicants' claimed superimposing feature. For at least this reason, the *Lofgren* patent fails to anticipate Applicants' claims.

To properly anticipate a claim, the document must disclose, explicitly or implicitly, each and every feature recited in the claim. *See* Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). By virtue of the foregoing discussion, claims 1 and 20 and the corresponding depending claims are distinguishable over the *Lofgren* patent. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 8 on page 6 of the Office Action, claims 21 and 22 are stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over the *Lofgren* patent in view of *Josypenko* (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,686). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Because claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 20 and Applicants have established that claim 20 is distinguishable over the *Lofgren* patent, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the *Josypenko* patent fails to disclose or suggest features that one of ordinary skill would find remedy the deficiencies of the *Lofgren* patent with respect to independent claim 20. Since the combination of the *Lofgren* and *Josypenko* patents fails to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination

of features recited in Applicants' claims, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 15, 16, 19-26, and 44 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 10, 2009 By: /Shawn B. Cage/
Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620